

1 Nina Perales, TX SBN: 24005046  
Carlos Becerra, IL SBN: 6285722  
2 Diego Bernal, TX SBN: 24048350  
MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL  
3 DEFENSE AND EDUCATIONAL FUND  
110 Broadway, Suite 300  
4 San Antonio, TX 78205  
Ph: (210) 224-5476  
5 nperales@maldef.org  
cbecerra@maldef.org  
6 dbernal@maldef.org

7 Daniel R. Ortega, Jr., SBN: 005015  
ROUSH, MCCRACKEN, GUERRERO,  
8 MILLER & ORTEGA  
650 North Third Avenue  
9 Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
Ph: (602) 253-3554  
10 danny@rmgmoinjurylaw.com

11 Karl J. Sandstrom  
PERKINS COIE, LLP  
12 607 Fourteenth Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
13 Ph:(202)434-1639  
14 ksansdstrom@perkinscoie.com

15 Attorneys for Gonzalez Plaintiffs  
16

17 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

19 Maria M. Gonzalez, et al.,  
20 Plaintiffs,

21 vs.

22 State of Arizona, et al,  
23 Defendants.  
24

) No. CV-06-1268-PHX-ROS(Lead)  
) No. CV-06-1362-PCT-JAT(Cons.)  
) No. CV-06-1575-PHX-EHC(Cons.)  
)  
) GONZALEZ PLAINTIFFS'  
) RESPONSE TO SEPARATE  
) STATEMENT OF FACTS IN  
) SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR  
) PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
) BY DEFENDANTS STATE OF  
) ARIZONA AND THE ARIZONA  
) SECRETARY OF STATE  
)

25  
26  
27 (Assigned to the  
28 Honorable Roslyn O. Silver)

1 Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 56 and Local Civil Rule 56.1, Plaintiffs Maria M.  
2 Gonzalez, Jesus M. Gonzalez, Bernie Abeytia, Luciano Valencia, Debbie Lopez,  
3 Southwest Voter Registration Education Project, Valle Del Sol, Friendly House,  
4 Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc., and Arizona Hispanic Community Forum (“Gonzalez  
5 Plaintiffs”) set forth the following statements of issues in opposition to Defendants  
6 Separate Statement of Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment by  
7 Defendants State of Arizona and the Arizona Secretary of State [Dkt. No. 282-8].  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

The following Response to the Separate Statement of Fact in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment by Defendants State of Arizona and the Arizona Secretary of State (“Response”) is divided into three parts. Part I is a response to items in Defendants’ statement of facts. Part II contains the Gonzalez Plaintiffs Statement of Facts pertinent procedural and substantive aspects of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (“NVRA”), including the legislative history. Part III focuses on facts relating to the implementation of the “Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act” (which appeared on the ballot in November 2004 as Proposition 200 and is referred to herein as “Proposition 200” or “Prop 200”).

1  
2 **I. Response to Items in Defendants' "Separate Statement of Facts in Support**  
3 **of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment by Defendants State of Arizona**  
4 **and the Arizona Secretary of State"**

5 ¶ 1. On November 2, 2004, Arizona voters adopted by ballot initiative  
6 Proposition 200 ("Prop 200") [Decl. of Counsel in Supp. of Mot. For Partial Summary  
7 Judgment by Defs. State of Arizona and the Arizona Secretary of State ("Counsel  
8 Decl.") Tab 1 (Letter dated December 9, 2004, from Jessica Funkhouser to Joseph  
9 Rich, and exhibits A and B thereto)]

10 **RESPONSE:** Not disputed.

11 ¶ 2. Section 3, 4 and 5 of Prop 200 amended Arizona's voting laws in two  
12 substantive ways: (1) applicants to register to vote were required to submit proof of U.S.  
13 citizenship; and (2) voters who choose to vote in-person at the polls on election day (as  
14 opposed to early voters) would be required to present identification [Counsel Decl. Tab  
15 1 ex. A (Proposition 200 Official title, An Initiative Measure), at pp. 1-3)]

16 **RESPONSE:** Disputed to the extent that former A.R.S. § 16-152 already  
17 required voter registration applicants to provide proof of U.S. citizenship in the form of  
18 signing an attestations of citizenship and acknowledging that executing a false  
19 registration form was a class 6 felony. See A.R.S. § 16-152, Statutory Notes.

20 ¶ 3. On December 9, 2004, the Arizona Attorney General submitted to the  
21 U.S. Department of Justice ("DOJ") a request for preclearance of Sections 3, 4 and 5 of  
22 Prop 200. Dkt. # 282-8, attachment 1]

23 **RESPONSE:** Disputed to the extent that the preclearance request did not  
24 notify the DOJ that Arizona would change its NVRA procedures and failed to notify  
25

1 DOJ that Arizona would condition acceptance of the federal mail voter registration  
2 application upon submission by the applicant of documentary proof of citizenship  
3 pursuant to Prop 200. *Id.*  
4

5 ¶ 4. The request for preclearance expressly stated, among other things, that  
6 Prop 200's amendments would "require applicants registering to vote to provide  
7 evidence of United States citizenship with the application." [Counsel Decl. tab 1 (Letter  
8 dated December 9, 2004 from Jessica Funkhouser to Joseph Rich at p. 1)]  
9

10 **RESPONSE:** Disputed to the extent that the preclearance request did not  
11 notify the DOJ that Arizona would change its NVRA procedures and failed to notify  
12 DOJ that Arizona would condition acceptance of the federal mail voter registration  
13 application upon submission by the applicant of documentary proof of citizenship  
14 pursuant to Prop 200. [Counsel Decl. Tab 1 (Letter dated December 9, 2004 from  
15 Jessica Funkhouser to Joseph Rich)]  
16

17 ¶ 5. The preclearance request letter also included an "Analysis by Legislative  
18 Council" of Prop 200's amendments to Arizona's voting laws, which analysis expressly  
19 stated that the amendments "would required that evidence of United States citizenship  
20 be presented by every person to register to vote," and which set forth the forms of  
21 identification specified by Prop 200 that would constitute satisfactory evidence of U.S.  
22 citizenship. [Counsel Decl. Tab 1 (Letter dated December 9, 2004 from Jessica  
23 Funkhouser to Joseph Rich at p. 2)]  
24  
25

26 **RESPONSE:** Disputed to the extent that the preclearance request did not  
27 notify the DOJ that Arizona would change its NVRA procedures and failed to notify  
28

1 DOJ that Arizona would condition acceptance of the federal mail voter registration  
2 application upon submission by the applicant of documentary proof of citizenship  
3 pursuant to Prop 200. [Counsel Decl. Tab 1 (Letter dated December 9, 2004 from  
4 Jessica Funkhouser to Joseph Rich)]  
5

6 ¶ 6. The submission package to the DOJ comprised many pages and attached  
7 numerous exhibits of information about Prop 200, including copies of the initiative, the  
8 laws to be amended by Prop 200, and articles and other public information relating to its  
9 passage. [Counsel Decl. Tab 1 (Letter dated December 9, 2004 from Jessica Funkhouser  
10 to Joseph Rich, (referencing attached exhibits), and exhibits A and B thereto)]  
11

12 **RESPONSE:** Disputed to the extent that the Declaration of Counsel in  
13 Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment by Defendants State of Arizona and  
14 the Arizona Secretary of State failed to include any “articles and other public  
15 information.” Also, disputed to the extent that DOJ neither notified nor included for  
16 DOJ review A.R.S. § 16-121.01 which: set out the “requirements for proper  
17 registration” in Arizona prior to the passage of Proposition 200; paralleled the voter  
18 registration requirements of the NVRA, thus enabling Arizona to use its own state form  
19 to register voters in federal elections pursuant to the NVRA; and which the State now  
20 contends was materially altered by Proposition 200’s documentary proof of citizenship  
21 requirement. Also, disputed to the extent that the preclearance request did not notify  
22 DOJ that Arizona would change its NVRA procedures and did not notify DOJ that  
23 Arizona would condition acceptance of the federal mail voter registration application  
24 upon submission by the applicant of documentary proof of citizenship pursuant to Prop  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 200. [Counsel Decl. Tab 1 (Letter dated December 9, 2004 from Jessica Funkhouser  
2 to Joseph Rich, (referencing attached exhibits), and exhibits A and B thereto)]

3 ¶ 7. The DOJ precleared (*i.e.*, the voting-related amendments) Sections 3, 4  
4 and Section 5 of Prop 200 on January 24, 2005. [Counsel Decl. Tab 2 (Letter dated  
5 January 24, 2005 from Joseph Rich to Jessica Funkhouse)]  
6

7 **RESPONSE:** Disputed. DOJ did not preclear any implementation of  
8 Prop 200 that would change Arizona's NVRA procedures and did not preclear any  
9 change by Arizona that would condition acceptance of the federal mail voter registration  
10 application upon submission of documentary proof of citizenship pursuant to Prop 200.  
11

12 ¶ 8. Since the inception of the National Voter Registration Act in 1995,  
13 Arizona has used and accepted for voter registration the Federal Mail Voter Registration  
14 Form (Federal Form), which was developed by the U.S. Election Assistance  
15 Commission ("EAC"). [Counsel Decl. Tab 3 (Affidavit of Joseph Kanefield dated May  
16 31, 2006 ("Kanefield Aff.") ¶ 2]  
17

18 **RESPONSE:** Disputed. Defendants have not used and accepted the  
19 Federal Mail Voter Registration Form (Federal Form) which was developed by the U.S.  
20 Election Assistance Commission ("EAC"). First, the Federal Form was developed by  
21 the Federal Election Commission and not the EAC prior to 2002. Second, Defendants  
22 do not make the Federal Form available to the public. Third, since Proposition 200 was  
23 implemented in 2005, Defendants have rejected properly-completed Federal Forms that  
24 were not accompanied by documentary proof of citizenship as defined in A.R.S. § 16-  
25 166(F). [[Counsel Decl. Tab 3 (Affidavit of Joseph Kanefield dated May 31, 2006  
26  
27  
28

1 (“Kanefield Aff.”) ¶ 3; Kanefiled depo. 147:9-150:16.; Perales Decl. Ex. E; Rodriguez  
2 depo. 83:13-84:6; Osborne depo. p.42:24 – 43:17]

3 ¶ 9. Following the implementation of Prop 200, Arizona has continued to  
4 accept both the Federal Form and Arizona’s form for voter registration purposed,  
5 although the State requires submission of proof of U.S. citizenship along with  
6 whichever application form the registrant submits. [Counsel Decl. Tab 3 (Kanefield  
7 Aff.) ¶ 2]  
8

9  
10 **RESPONSE:** Disputed. Defendants reject properly-completed Federal  
11 Forms that are not accompanied by documentary proof of citizenship as defined in  
12 A.R.S. § 16-166(F). [Counsel Decl. Tab 3 (Affidavit of Joseph Kanefield dated May  
13 31, 2006 (“Kanefield Aff.”) ¶ 3]  
14

15 ¶ 10. The Arizona Secretary of State makes the Federal Form available to  
16 anyone who requests it, and the form is available for downloading and printing on the  
17 EAC’s website. [Counsel Decl. Tab 3 (Kanefield Aff.) ¶ 4]  
18

19 **RESPONSE:** Disputed. Defendant Arizona Secretary of State does not  
20 make the Federal Form available to the public unless an individual makes a specific  
21 request for the Federal Form. The Secretary of State only displays and makes available  
22 on the counter the Arizona State registration form. [Kanefield Depo. 147:9-150:16.]  
23

24 ¶ 11. Most individuals who are eligible to register to vote already possess a  
25 driver’s license or nonoperating identification card, and thus do not require any other  
26 identification to vote. [Counsel Decl. Tab 4 (Deposition of Ronald Anthony Sissons  
27 dated August 11, 2006), at 77:15-21)]  
28



1                   **RESPONSE:** Disputed. The statement assumes incorrectly that all AZ  
2 driver's licenses and nonoperating identification cards constitute sufficient proof of  
3 citizenship under Proposition 200. According to the Arizona Department of  
4 Transportation, as of August 3, 2006, 576,040 Arizonans held drivers' licenses or state  
5 identification cards that were issued before 1996. None of these more than one-half  
6 million people can use their drivers' licenses or state identification cards to register to  
7 vote because Proposition 200 excludes these documents from the list of acceptable  
8 forms of proof of citizenship. All of these more than half-million people who are  
9 eligible to register to vote must obtain another document proving their citizenship in  
10 order to register. [Exhibit 59 to ITCA Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Preliminary  
11 Injunction]  
12  
13

14                   ¶ 12. Many counties send official election mail and voter registration cards and  
15 inform voters that they may use those items as identification at the polls. Those items  
16 are free. [Counsel Decl. Tab 5 (County Defendant Responses to Requests for  
17 Production); Tab 6 (Deposition of Karen Osborne, dated July 31, 2006), at 60:22-62:6;  
18 Tab 7 (Deposition of F. Ann Rodriguez, dated August 2, 2006), at 84:7-12 and 85:25-  
19 86:4; Tab 8 (Deposition of Kelly Dastrup, dated August 1, 2006), at 10:7-14 and 11:22-  
20 13:1]  
21  
22

23                   **RESPONSE:** Disputed to the extent that the term "many" is  
24 unquantifiable. Moreover, sent election mail and voter registration cards are not listed  
25 as acceptable identification at the polling place. [Exhibit 3 from pi hearing] In  
26  
27  
28

1 addition, there is no evidence in the record that counties who may have sent election  
2 mail and voter registration cards will do so in the future.

### 3 GONZALEZ PLAINTIFFS STATEMENT OF FACTS

#### 4 **II. THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993**

5  
6 1. Section 9 of the NVRA requires the Federal Election Commission (FEC)  
7 to develop a national mail voter registration form (“form”) for elections to federal  
8 office. 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-1 *et seq.* The FEC was charged with creating a form that  
9 complied with the NVRA and contained all elements necessary for states to determine  
10 voter qualification and administer voter registration. 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-7(b)(1).

11  
12 2. Congress found that mail registration was a particularly effective means  
13 of voter registration, and emphasized its importance by granting authority to create a  
14 uniform, national voter registration form with a federal government agency. *See* 42  
15 U.S.C § 1793gg-7.

16  
17 3. When President Clinton signed the NVRA into law, he noted that uniform  
18 national “registration for Federal election[s] will become as accessible as possible,  
19 while the integrity of the electoral process is clearly preserved.” Remarks on Signing  
20 the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, 29 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 915 (May  
21 20, 1993).

22  
23  
24 4. On February 23, 1993, Congress received a report from the Senate  
25 Committee on Rules and Administration regarding the National Voter registration Act.  
26 The Committee reported to Congress that “[t]he purposes of the [NVRA] are to  
27 establish procedures which will increase registration of eligible citizens in elections for  
28

1 Federal office; to make it possible for Federal, State, and local governments to  
2 implement the Act in a manner that enhances the participation of eligible citizens as  
3 voters in elections for Federal office; to protect the integrity of the political process; and  
4 to assure an accurate and current voter registration roll.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 1 (1993).  
5

6 5. The Senate Committee also explained that to “increase registration of  
7 eligible citizens, [the NVRA] would require States that require registration to vote in  
8 elections for Federal office, to permit voter registration by the following means, in  
9 addition to any other method provided by State law: (a) by application simultaneous  
10 with an application for a motor vehicle drivers license so-called ‘motor-voter’  
11 registration; (b) by use of a uniform mail application; and (c) by application in person at  
12 an agency designated to process registration applications in each State.” S. Rep. 103-6,  
13 at 1 (1993).  
14  
15

16 6. The Senate Committee reported that the NVRA was designed to “provide  
17 uniform national voter registration procedures for Federal elections and thereby further  
18 the procedural reform intended by the Voting Rights Act,” by alleviating discriminatory  
19 voter registration practices employed by some states. S. Rep. 103-6, at 2 (1993).  
20

21 7. The Committee noted that “[i]t must be remembered that that the purpose  
22 of [the United States’] election process is not to test the fortitude of the voter, but to  
23 discern the will of the majority.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 2 (1993).  
24

25 8. The Senate Committee addressed Congress’ ability to pass the NVRA:  
26 “Congress has the power to regulate federal elections, including the establishment of  
27  
28

1 voter registration procedures for Presidential and congressional elections.” S. Rep. 103-  
2 6, at 3 (1993).

3           9.     The Committee’s report also noted, “Congress’ power has been clearly  
4 established under the Times, Places, and Manner Clause and the Necessary and Proper  
5 Clause of the Constitution. These provisions, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, belie  
6 assertions by those who argue that the States have exclusive authority to regulate the  
7 manner in which Federal elections are conducted.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 3 (1993).  
8

9           10.    The Committee’s report states the NVRA is an appropriate use of  
10 congressional power. S. Rep. 103-6, at 3 (1993).  
11

12           11.    The Senate Committee reported that uniform mail registration is one of  
13 the purposes and objectives of the NVRA. S. Rep. 103-6, at 7 (1993).  
14

15           12.    The Committee believed the NVRA’s requirements that the registrant  
16 produce proof of their date of birth and attest to their age and citizenship, “together with  
17 the criminal sections of the bill...provides sufficient safeguards to prevent noncitizens  
18 from registering to vote.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 7-9 (1993).  
19

20           13.    The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration cited a 1984 study by  
21 the Congressional Research Service that found that States using mail registration  
22 procedures “had no more fraud with post card registration than with in-person  
23 registration.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 8 (1993).  
24

25           14.    The Senate Committee also reported that then-Governor of Oregon,  
26 Barbara Roberts, testified that the state’s mail registration system, instituted in 1975,  
27 had “not experienced any cases of fraud or fraudulent voting with mail registration...  
28

1 [and] despite Oregon's large migrant worker population, there [had] not been any  
2 indication of non-citizens registering to vote." S. Rep. 103-6, at 8 (1993).

3  
4 15. The Committee's report explains that criminal penalties under the NVRA  
5 for "willful offenses, including the submission of voter registration applications  
6 containing materially false information" are greater and more comprehensive than those  
7 in the Voting Rights Act. S. Rep. 103-6, at 7 (1993).

8  
9 16. The Senate Committee reported that a "registrant is permitted to use the  
10 Federal form or the appropriate State form and the States would be required to accept  
11 either form." S. Rep. 103-6, at 7 (1993).

12  
13 17. The Senate Committee stated in their report that "[m]ail registration is  
14 convenient for the voter, for registration drive organizers and for voter registrars as  
15 well." S. Rep. 103-6, at 8 (1993).

16  
17 18. With regard to agency-based registration program, the Senate Committee  
18 stated that the role of the program "is to provide forms to applicants and receive  
19 completed voter applications for transmittal to the appropriate State voting registration  
20 official." S. Rep. 103-6, at 11 (1993).

21  
22 19. The Senate Committee found that the mail registration application form  
23 "may not include information any requirement for notarization *or other formal*  
24 *authentication*, such as witnessing." S. Rep. 103-6, at 16 (1993).

25  
26 20. The Senate Committee found that a uniform mail registration application  
27 "will permit voter registration drives through a regional or national mailing, or for more  
28

1 than one State at a central location, such as a city where persons from a number of  
2 neighboring States work, shop or attend events.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 17 (1993).

3  
4 21. The Committee explained that the NVRA requires the chief State election  
5 official to make the mail registration form available to governmental and private  
6 entities, “with a particular emphasis on making such forms available to organized voter  
7 registration programs.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 17 (1993).

8  
9 22. In its report, the Senate Committee stated, “[b]road dissemination of mail  
10 application forms, when coupled with the other procedures of [the NVRA] should reach  
11 most persons eligible to register to vote, and is, therefore, a key element of the voter  
12 outreach feature of the bill.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 17 (1993).

13  
14 23. The Senate Committee found that the application procedures employed to  
15 prevent fraud, such as including setting forth the requirements to vote (including age  
16 and citizenship) and an attestation to be signed by the applicant under penalty of perjury  
17 were sufficient. S. Rep. 103-6, at 17 (1993).

18  
19 24. The Senate Committee noted that “[i]n those States that develop their own  
20 mail voter registration application, an applicant may use, and the State must accept,  
21 either the national form developed by the FEC or the State’s own form.” S. Rep. 103-6,  
22 at 17 (1993).

23  
24 25. The Senate Committee reported that the Federal Election Commission  
25 was responsible for developing regulations necessary to implement the NVRAS. Rep.  
26 103-6, at 22 (1993).

1           26.     The Senate Committee found that the FEC was also responsible for  
2 working with the Chief Election Officer of each State “to develop a mail voter  
3 registration application form for Federal elections[.]” S. Rep. 103-6, at 22 (1993).  
4

5           27.     The Committee found that the NVRA mandated that the mail registration  
6 form developed by the FEC “may only require such identifying information (including  
7 the signature of the applicant) and other information (including data relating to previous  
8 registrations) as is necessary to enable the appropriate State election official to assess  
9 the applicants eligibility. [It] must also include a statement that specifies each eligibility  
10 requirement (including citizenship); contain an attestation that the applicant meets such  
11 requirements, and require the signature of the applicant under penalty of perjury... [and]  
12 may not include any requirement for notarization or other formal authentication, i.e., a  
13 witness requirement.” S. Rep. 103-6, at 22-23 (1993).  
14  
15

16           28.     The Senate Committee found that the NVRA would supersede state laws  
17 that conflict with the bill, explaining the states would have to change their laws to be  
18 consistent with the NVRA, “[o]therwise, those states would have to maintain separate  
19 registration rolls and conduct federal elections separately from other elections.” S. Rep.  
20 103-6, at 27 (1993).  
21

22           29.     The Congressional Record for the Conference Report on the NVRA  
23 demonstrates the intent of Congress to establish a “uniform standard” for national voter  
24 registration, “a uniform set of procedures that will allow individuals to exercise the  
25 franchise to vote, whether they live in Iowa, or Minnesota, or Illinois, or Alaska, or  
26 Florida, or Texas, or California, or wherever in [the] United States they may reside.”  
27  
28

1 *See, e.g.,* 139 Cong. Rec. S 5677 (statement of Sen. Wellstone); *id* (statement of Sen.  
2 Moseley-Braun).

3  
4 30. Senator Wendell Ford of Kentucky addressed the fear of rampant voter  
5 fraud as a result of the NVRA by noting that Congress has not heard the same “fears  
6 coming from States who now have basically the same thing as [the NVRA].” 138  
7 Cong. Rep. S. 5677, 5682 (statement of Sen. Ford).

8  
9 31. During the floor debate over the NVRA in the House of Representatives,  
10 Representative Allen Swift of Washington stated that fears about non-citizens gaining  
11 the ability to vote because of the NVRA were unfounded and that citizenship would  
12 remain a requirement to vote. *See* 139 Cong. rec. H 505, 516.

13  
14 32. During the floor debate over the NVRA in the House of Representatives,  
15 Representative Bonior of Michigan stated that the NVRA was meant to remove  
16 antiquated and unnecessary obstacles in voter registration. *See* 139 Cong. rec. H 507.

17  
18 33. The House Committee stated in House Report 103-9 indicates that NVRA  
19 Subsection (a) requires that all States accept and use the mail voter registration form  
20 prescribed by the Federal Election Commission. In addition, States are permitted to  
21 develop and use their own mail registration form, provided it meets the requirements of  
22 this Act. Mail registration forms may also be used for voter registration change of  
23 address. *See* H.R. Rep. No. 103-9.

24  
25 34. The House Committee stated in House Report 103-9 indicates that  
26 Subsection (b) of the NVRA requires the chief State election official to make the mail  
27  
28



1 registration forms available for distribution through governmental and private entities,  
2 with a particular emphasis on making such forms available to organized voter  
3 registration programs. Broad dissemination of mail application forms, when coupled  
4 with the other procedures of this bill, should reach most persons eligible to register to  
5 vote, and is, therefore, a key element of the voter outreach feature of this bill. Such  
6 forms may also be disseminated to agencies designated under the agency-based  
7 registration procedures for use by those agencies in their registration programs. *See*  
8 H.R. Rep. No. 103-9.  
9

11       35. The House Committee stated in House Report 103-9 indicates that  
12 Subsection (b) of the NVRA sets forth the requirements of the mail registration form to  
13 be developed by the FEC and that the form may only require such identifying  
14 information (including the signature of the applicant) and other information (including  
15 data relating to previous registrations) as is necessary to enable the appropriate State  
16 election official to assess the applicants eligibility. *See* H.R. Rep. No. 103-9.  
17

18       36. The federal regulations require states to accept, use, and make available  
19 national mail voter registration form. 11 CFR. § 8.3.  
20

21       37. Federal regulations require the national mail voter registration form to  
22 include: the last, first, and middle name of the applicant; address where the applicant  
23 lives, mailing address if different from the address where the applicant lives; the month,  
24 day, and year of birth; and a voter identification number as required or requested by the  
25 applicant's state of residence for election administration purposes. 11 CFR. § 8.4.  
26  
27  
28

1           38.     The federal regulations do not require any documentation, including a  
2 citizenship document, be submitted in support of the national mail voter registration  
3 form. The federal regulations require that the application include a field for the  
4 signature of the applicant, under penalty of perjury, and the date of the applicant's  
5 signature. The federal regulations require that the form notify an applicant of the  
6 penalties provided by law for submitting a false voter registration application. 11 CFR.  
7 § 8.4.  
8

9  
10           39.     The federal regulations require that the application be a 5 inch by 8 inch in  
11 size and of sufficient stock and weight to satisfy postal regulations. In addition, the  
12 application card shall be attached by a perforated fold to another 5 inch by 8 inch card  
13 and the application card must be able to be sealed. 11 CFR. § 8.5.  
14

15           40.     The FEC in 11 C.F.R § 8.2(a) defined "form" for the federal registration  
16 application to include only the registration application, accompanying general  
17 instructions for completing the form, and state-specific instructions. The only items  
18 that the FEC designated as necessary to assess the eligibility of the applicant or to  
19 administer voter registration were: the applicant's name; the inclusion of an area for  
20 designating a suffix to the name; the former name, where applicable; a residential or  
21 mailing address; a former address, where applicable; and date of birth. 11 C.F.R. §  
22 8.4(a)(1)-(4); 59 F.R. 32311-01(I)(A)-(H).  
23

24  
25           41.     In 11 C.F.R. § 8.2(a), the FEC excluded certain items from the form  
26 because they did not meet the "necessary threshold" of the NVRA to assess the  
27 eligibility of the applicant or to administer voter registration. The FEC found that  
28

1 information regarding naturalization and place of birth was unnecessary. 59 F.R.  
2 32311-01(II)(A)- (K).

3 42. The FEC mandated that states “accept, use, and make available” the form  
4 described in 11 C.F. R. § 8.3. 11 C.F. R. § 8.3(c).

6 43. In 11 C.F.R. § 8.5(c)(1), the FEC states that the form should be self-  
7 sealable so that it remains in-tact through the mail. 59 F.R. 32311-01 (III)(A).

8 44. In considering reproduction methods for the forms, the FEC expressed  
9 concern that a photocopied application would be too flimsy to send through the mail.  
10 59 F.R. 32311-01 (III)(F). The FEC recognized that a photocopied form could be  
11 mailed in an envelope or delivered by hand, but expressed reluctance to create  
12 additional burdens on those applicants who were forced to do so. 59 F.R. 32311-01  
13 (III)(B).

14 45. The Senate Minority report states that the NVRA prohibits citizenship  
15 verification voter registration schemes. Opponents of the NVRA cited its failure to  
16 require and its prohibition against citizenship verification as a basis for opposition. *See*  
17 S. Rep. 103-6, at 55 (“[Non-citizen voting] fraud might be combated by requiring proof  
18 of citizenship at the time of registration. However, mail registration under this bill  
19 would preclude such corrective action.”).

20 46. The Congressional records for a previous version of the NVRA, which  
21 was not signed into law, reveal that the lack of citizenship verification was a major  
22 source of contention and generated substantial opposition- based primarily on fears of  
23 voter fraud- from both Houses and the Department of Justice. *See* S. Rep. 102-60, at  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 40, 62 (1991); S. Rep. 103-6, at 53, 55. President Bush agreed and vetoed the bill,  
2 believing that it “would expose the election process to an unacceptable risk of fraud and  
3 corruption.” 138 Cong. Rec. S9772.  
4

5 47. When the bill that would become the NVRA was reintroduced in 1993,  
6 the debate over citizenship verification continued. *See, e.g.*, 139 Cong. Rec. H505,  
7 H506 (daily ed. Feb. 4, 1993), H510.  
8

9 48. Amendments eliminating the mail registration component, demanding  
10 states to certify that they have fraud prevention measures in place, and the addition of  
11 statements which discouraged non-citizens from registering were ultimately defeated.  
12 *See* 139 Cong. Rec. H505, H528; 139 Cong. Rec. H288, H295 (daily ed. Jan 27, 1993).  
13

14 49. The Senate passed an amendment which read, “Nothing in this Act shall  
15 be construed to preclude a State from requiring presentation of documentary evidence of  
16 the citizenship of an applicant for voter registration.” 139 Cong. Rec. S2897, S2901  
17 (daily ed. March 16, 1993).  
18

19 50. The conference committee rejected the Senate amendment allowing states  
20 to require documentary proof of citizenship, stating, “[i]t is not necessary or consistent  
21 with the purposes of [the NVRA].” H. Rep. 103-66, at 23-24 (1993).  
22

23 51. The Senate amendment allowing States to require documentary proof of  
24 citizenship was the only amendment completely rejected in the conference committee.  
25 H. Rep. 103-66, at 23-24 (1993).  
26

### 27 **III. PROPOSITION 200**

28

1           52.     On December 12, 2005, the Arizona Secretary of State's office contacted  
2 the EAC and asked the Commission to include the state's documentary proof of  
3 citizenship requirement in the instructions to voter registration applicants using the  
4 federal registration application. *See Perales Decl. Ex. E.*

6           53.     In a letter dated March 6, 2006, the EAC's Executive Director Thomas  
7 Wilkey explained that Proposition 200's documentary proof of citizenship requirement  
8 does "not alter the state's voter qualifications... [it] is merely an additional means to  
9 document or prove the existing voter eligibility requirement of citizenship." Thus,  
10 Proposition 200's proof of citizenship requirements "deal with the manner in which  
11 registration is conducted and are, therefore, preempted by Federal law." *See Id.*

13           54.     The March 6, 2006 letter stated that Arizona "may not mandate additional  
14 registration procedures that condition the acceptance of the Federal Form" on the  
15 applicant's production of additional documentary proof of citizenship. The letter also  
16 explained that the NVRA was a proper exercise of that power, and the Act requires that  
17 States accept and use the Federal Form created by the EAC. The letter also stated that  
18 the Federal Form's "checkbox" for citizenship, along with the applicant's attestation  
19 and signature under penalty of perjury, is the verification method Congress has chosen  
20 to register voters for federal elections, and a state is preempted from imposing  
21 additional requirements for acceptance of the Federal Form. The letter went on to state  
22 that while the State had the authority to determine voter and voter registrant  
23 qualifications for state elections, Arizona must comply with federal regulations with  
24 regard to federal elections. *See Id.*

1           55.     In a letter dated March 13, 2006, Secretary of State Jan Brewer responded  
2 to the March 6, 2006 letter from the EAC. In her letter, Secretary of State Brewer stated  
3 that she disagreed with the EAC's position that Proposition 200's proof of citizenship  
4 requirements were preempted by federal law and therefore must not be made a  
5 condition for voter registration. The letter also stated that she would instruct Arizona's  
6 country recorders to enforce the requirements of Proposition 200 for all voter  
7 applicants, and again urged the EAC to instruct Arizona applicants using the Federal  
8 Form to provide documentary proof of citizenship as required by Proposition 200. *See*  
9 *Id.*

12           56.     In a letter dated June 20, 2006, Secretary of State Brewer requested the  
13 EAC to incorporate Arizona's documentary proof of citizenship requirements in the  
14 instructions to the Federal Form. *See Id.*

16           57.     On July 11, 2006 the EAC held a tally vote on the question whether to  
17 include Arizona's documentary proof of citizenship requirements in the instructions to  
18 the Federal Form. The measure failed. *See Id.* at Ex. J.

20           58.     The State did not describe anywhere in its preclearance submission that it  
21 would abandon its practice of accepting the Federal Voter Registration Form and made  
22 no mention of the NVRA. Instead, the State only described its planned changes to state  
23 law and state voter registration procedures. *See* Dkt. No. 282, Attach. 1.

25           59.     Proposition 200 has resulted in close to 30,000 rejected voter registration  
26 applications because they did not include documentary proof of citizenship. Dkt.  
27 No.283, attachment 1 at Ex. I-M.

1           60.     Patty Hansen, the Elections Administrator for Coconino County, testified  
2 that if an individual or organization wanted an actual federal voter registration form,  
3 they would be referred to the Secretary of State's Office or the Elections Assistance  
4 Commission. Hansen Dep. at 36:6-10.

6           61.     Joseph Kanefield, State of Arizona Elections Director, testified that the  
7 Secretary of State has a policy of requiring county recorders to reject federal mail voter  
8 registration applications that are not accompanied by satisfactory proof of citizenship.  
9 Kanefield Dep. at 80:20-81:24.

11          62.     Joseph Kanefield testified that he did not know if the federal voter  
12 registration form was available at the Motor Vehicle Division. Kanefield Dep. at  
13 147:18-148:19.

15          63.     Joseph Kanefield testified that he did not know if the federal voter  
16 registration form was available at state agencies. Kanefield Dep. at 148:15-18.

17          64.     Joseph Kanefield testified that he did not know if the federal form was  
18 available at offices that provide public assistance in Arizona. Kanefield Dep. at 149:  
19 13-16.

21          65.     Joseph Kanefield testified that at the Secretary of State's office both the  
22 federal and state registration forms are available. He also testified that at the Secretary  
23 of State's office the federal forms are not displayed where individuals can take them  
24 without specifically asking for the federal form. Kanefield Dep. at 149: 17-23.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           66. Karen Osborne, the Maricopa County Elections Director, testified that the  
2 Maricopa County Elections Department does not have federal mail voter registration  
3 forms available in the office. Osborne Dep. at 42:22-24.  
4

5           67. Karen Osborne testified that when voter registration organizations request  
6 voter registration forms from Maricopa County, they are provided only with Arizona  
7 forms. Osborne Dep. at 43:2-11.  
8

9           68. Karen Osborne testified that she believes that United States citizens living  
10 in Maricopa County who are eligible to register to vote have been unable to do so since  
11 Proposition 200 went into effect because they lack the necessary documents. Osborne  
12 Dep. at 43:12-17.  
13

14           69. Karen Osborne testified that in at least one instance Maricopa County has  
15 turned away eligible voters who attempted to register but lacked the necessary  
16 documents required by Proposition 200. Osborne Dep. at 43:21-44:9.  
17

18           70. Karen Osborne testified that she believes the attestation section of the  
19 registration form adequate to ensure that qualified persons were registering to vote.  
20 Osborne Dep. at 105:3-6.

21           71. F. Ann Rodriguez, Pima County Recorder, testified that voter registration  
22 applicants whose applications are insufficient because they fail to provide materials  
23 required by Proposition 200 will not be added to the voter rolls until they provide the  
24 mandated materials. Rodriguez Dep. at 23:16-22.  
25

26           72. F. Ann Rodriguez testified that she could not recall any written guidance  
27 from the state of Arizona on how to implement the proof of citizenship requirements of  
28



1 Proposition 200. Rodriguez Dep. at 34:13-34:17.

2 73. F. Ann Rodriguez testified that she does not recall the Secretary of State  
3 for Arizona ever asking or instructing her to distribute or make available the federal  
4 mail voter registration applications. Rodriguez Depo at 84:1-6.

6 74. F. Ann Rodriguez testified that she knows that potential registrants are not  
7 submitting voter registration applications because they lack the necessary documents.  
8 Ms. Rodriguez used the example of her mother who was born in New Mexico as an  
9 example of the hardships some individuals may have in obtaining the necessary  
10 documentation in order to register to vote. Rodriguez Depo at 88:23-89:20.

12 75. Luciano Valencia, a United States Citizen who meets all of the  
13 requirements to vote in Arizona, testified that he presented a completed federal  
14 registration application prescribed by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission to a  
15 clerk at the Pima County Recorder's Office. Mr. Valencia testified that the Clerk stated  
16 that his application would not be processed because his application did not include  
17 proof of citizenship. *See* Prelim. Inj. Hr'g. Ex. 217; Valencia Decl. at 1, July 25,  
18 2006.

21 76. Lydia Camarillo, Vice President of the Southwest Voter  
22 Registration Education Project (SVREP), a non-profit and non-partisan organization  
23 committed to improving the participation of Latino and other minority communities  
24 across the United States in the democratic process through among other things voter  
25 registration drives, testified that Proposition 200's proof of citizenship requirements for  
26 voter registration will severely impair the ability of SVREP to register voters in Arizona  
27  
28

1 because it requires canvassers to bring along photocopy machines or scanners and  
2 printers to places where voters gather, or to bring such a machine door-to-door in a  
3 neighborhood. Ms. Camarillo also testified that SVREP may not have the resources to  
4 purchase this equipment, and even if they could purchase the necessary equipment,  
5 voter registration applicants are unlikely to allow a canvasser to copy citizenship  
6 documents. *See* Prelim. Inj. Hr'g. Ex. 218 Camarillo Decl. at 3-4, July 25, 2006.  
7  
8  
9

10 77. Ms. Camarillo testified that Proposition 200's proof of citizenship  
11 requirements for voter registration will severely impair the ability of SVREP to register  
12 voters by requiring all canvassers to bring along photocopy machines or scanners and  
13 printers to places where voters gather, or to bring such a machine door-to-door in a  
14 neighborhood. *See Id.* at 4.  
15  
16  
17

18 DATED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

20 By: /s/Nina Perales  
Nina Perales

21  
22 Counsel for Plaintiffs  
Gonzalez, et al.  
23  
24

25 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

26 I hereby certify that on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007, I caused the foregoing  
27 document to be electronically transmitted to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF  
28 System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to CM/ECF registrants.

1 COPY of the foregoing filed electronically  
2 this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

3 COPY of the foregoing mailed with Notice  
4 of Electronic Filing this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007 to:

5 The Honorable Roslyn O. Silver  
6 United States District Court  
7 Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 624  
8 401 West Washington Street, SPC 59  
9 Phoenix, AZ 85003-2158

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
  
/s/Nina Perales  
Nina Perales